DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 915 CG 005 944

AUTHOR Cytrynbaum, Sonny
TITLE Project Outreach: An Approach to Human Relationships, Experiential Learning and Community Action in the Introductory Psychology Course.
INSTITUTION American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.; Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Dept. of Psychology.
PUB DATE 2 Sep 69
NOTE 22p.; Presented at American Psychological Association Convention, Washington, D.C., September, 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20
DESCRIPTORS College Freshmen, *College Students, *Educational Change, *Educational Innovation, Educational Needs, Educational Objectives, *Educational Programs, Educational Trends, *Effective Teaching, Experience, Experimental Programs, Instructional Innovation, Student Experience

ABSTRACT

Rooted in the contemporary challenge to traditional classroom practices, Project Outreach was developed by 35 Psychology 101 teaching fellows at the University of Michigan. The program gives students the opportunity to participate in: (1) diverse service or social action activities; (2) experiential-oriented educational and growth opportunities; or (3) a number of discussion groups, the content of which is highly untraditional for Psychology 101. The current scope of the program is elaborated and a selected listing and brief description of the projects included. General discussion focuses on: (1) the peer group model of supervision utilized in the program; (2) self-report data which suggests that program casualties anticipated by skeptics did not materialize; (3) the continued workability of the program in spite of its size and complexity; (4) the question of how to integrate student experiences with course content; and (5) concerns of students centering on their short-term community involvement. The report concludes that an effort such as Project Outreach has implications for both teacher-student relationships and for the joint education-community institutuional partnership. (TL)

Project Outreach: An Approach to Human Relationships, Experiential Learning and Community Action in the Introductory Psychology Course.

by
Sonny Cytrynbaum
Department of Psychology
University of Michigan

Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, September 2, 1969, Washington, D.C.

Student activism and rebellion of the past few years, the continuing effects of white racism, and the demands from black students for a relevant education have generated an atmosphere of crisis in American higher education. In response administrators and faculty have expressed varying degrees of support for innovations aimed at increasing the social and personal relevance of the college experience. However, radical challenges to the traditional view of the college classroom as a bastion of rationality have only rarely had any significant impact on teachers and administrators preoccupied with a narrow domain of cognitive and abstract concerns. Very few of the 2300 or so American institutions of higher education have welcomed social action programs, opportunities for experiential or interpersonal learning, or major reorganizations of curricula. Those innovative programs that have been adopted have frequently been viewed as ancillary step-children who must be endured. Our purpose in this paper is to present Project Outreach, an example of such a step-child. We shall begin by describing the relationship between Outreach and the Introductory Psychology course.

Psychology 101, entitled An Introduction to Psychology as a Social Science, is currently a four credit hour course offered to about 1300 University of Michigan students each Fall and Winter term and to about 200 students during the Summer months. It is taught by graduate students who are appointed as teaching fellows in the Department of Psychology. Thus, each term about thirty-five teaching fellows are responsible for approximately fifty discussion sections averaging 27 students each. Sections meet three hours weekly for lectures, discussions or other learning opportunities, and teaching fellows are free to use the fourth hour as they wish.

The evolution of the course has been such that the discussion section belongs to the teaching fellow; there are no common texts, lectures, or exams.

Each teaching fellow functions autonomously, as an independent agent who is primarily responsible to and can expect to be supported by his peers and a faculty coordinator. On the whole, this group of teaching fellows enjoys and values teaching, and in the past, it has spent a great deal of time and energy discussing and thinking about both individual classes and more general teaching-learning issues of mutual interest and concern. The teaching fellow peer culture and its related network of personal relationships serve not only as a system of informal control but also as a potent source of stimulation, support and rewards for creative teaching-learning innovations.

In the Spring of 1965 this group of energetic graduate students and their faculty coordinator, worked on several persistent and common sources of dissatisfaction. The most pressing of these were concerns about the passive, receptive learning styles manifested by some students; the inability of the teaching fellows to connect with some students despite a manageable class size and considerable opportunity for student participation in discussions; the frustration of the teaching fellows with the more traditional segmented survey of such discrete substantive topics as statistics, motivation, learning and other areas often judged to be of little relevance to their students; and their desire to revitalize the fourth weekly common lecture hour which was poorly attended and generally regarded as unsatisfactory. This dissatisfaction with the fourth hour occurred despite a number of efforts to generate student interest and enthusiasm through unusual and presumably intriguing lectures, provocative films, and animated panel discussions.

Having failed to achieve the desired response to these activities from students, the fourth hour lecture was cancelled in the Spring of 1965, and the time was turned over to the teaching fellows. Subsequently, a subgroup met over the Summer and

gradually evolved a series of substitute activites called Outreach which made it possible for students to break out of the classroom into the "laboratory of real life".[1] Initial arrangements were made by about eight Psychology 101 teaching fellows and in the Fall of 1965 about three hundred students were offered, among other possibilities, the opportunity to spend from three to five hours per week working with adult patients on the back wards of a state hospital, with children and adolescents in a residential treatment center, tutoring an OEO tutee, or they could participate in a self-analytic sensitivity training (T) group. Usually, students who chose to participate in service-oriented projects later met with a supervisor on campus in order to share their experiences, feelings, concerns, questions, and (hopefully) what they had learned.

Outreach is therefore a rubric under which is subsumed a variety of diverse service or social action activities, experiential-oriented educational and growth opportunities, as well as a number of discussion groups which focus on substantive problems or content areas not usually considered to be part of an introductory psychology course. With the exception of the T-group projects (which have a faculty consultant) Outreach projects are developed, administered, and entirely staffed by graduate student teaching fellows, by other graduate students either appointed as Outreach teaching fellows or on a volunteer basis, by experienced undergraduates, and by permanent staff members at the various participating agencies, schools, hospitals or clinics. Projects are open to students registered in Psychology 101 when their teaching fellows elect to make them available, as well as to other courses, if the instructor of the course agrees to serve as a supervisor. The nature and

---

1 A more detailed presentation of the early development, structure, organization and evolution of Outreach entitled Outreach: An Approach to Human Relationships in the Introductory Course. Report of a Symposium given at the American Psychological Association Convention, September 3, 1966, is available upon request.

number of projects offered vary from term to term depending primarily on graduate or undergraduate student interest in leading ongoing projects, or in starting new ones, or in response to suggestions from undergraduates. As is the case in the introductory course, Outreach project supervisors are totally autonomous and they are responsible for their project and students.

From its tentative and rather risky beginnings over three years ago, Outreach has grown rather explosively into a huge and at times unwieldy enterprize. This growth has been accompanied by a proliferation of new and unusual projects, an increasing number of participating students, numerous student requests to continue participating beyond one term, and a continuing capacity to attract a large group of graduate student supervisors with diverse backgrounds and departmental affiliations.

Currently there are about 44 projects being offered, and these are subdivided into six major sub-areas. These projects serve about 1400 students each term; they are supervised by about 120 graduate students, 80 or so experienced undergraduates, and some permanent staff from the participating institutions and agenices. Although it might be useful to describe in detail the current group of Outreach projects, space limitations prohibit this. A sixty page booklet is required in order to describe all of these projects for students so that they can make fairly knowledgeable choices. However, in order to convey to the reader some feeling for the range and diversity of the program a selected listing and very brief description is provided in Table I which follows.[2]

---

2 Each term a new descriptive booklet is compiled. Copies of the latest version are available from Project Outreach, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104.

TABLE I Selected Outreach Projects: Fall-Winter 1968-69.[3]

Project	Description	Approx. No. of Participating Students	Supervisors Grad	Undergrad
I. Social Institutions and Social Structure				
Psychology & Religion	discussion project; focus on functional aspects of different religions, relate to a psychology of being	40	3	
Psychology & Law	discussion, observation and participation; topics include civil disobedience, drugs, legal insanity, divorce, homosexuality; students can also serve as jurors in mock trials at the U.of M. Law School and visit courts	40	3	
South Lyon Teenage Community Structure	students have the opportunity to learn about high school & community peer cultures in So. Lyon, a town of 8000, 20 miles from Ann Arbor by meeting, socializing and getting to know students and small groups in the So. Lyon High School	15	1	
Israeli Kibbutz	discussion and audio-visual; use of slides, films, readings and contact with Kibbutz-reared supervisors and students in order to develop an understanding of the Israeli Kibbutz as an educational, child-rearing and social institution	10	1	

3 Many of these projects have been offered for several terms and will probably continue to be available. Others, chosen by too few students or lacking an interested supervisor will be temporarily or permanently dropped.

Project	Description	Approx. No. of Participating Students	Supervisors Grad	Undergrad
Psychology and the 1968 Elections	discussion project; analysis of results and implications of 1968 Presidential election	10	1	
Psychology and the Military	discussion project; topics include the "military mind" myth or real, motivational characteristics of soldiers, forms of war, Viet Nam; interview campus military representatives	15	1	
Psychology & World Politics	discussion group, explores the relationship between the individual and international system	10	1	
II. Conflict and Strategies for Change.				
Psychology of Conflict	discussion and demonstration group; analysis of conflict and conflict resolution; Viet Nam as an example; simulation of conflict situations, role-playing and game theory	20	2	
Psychology of Aggression and Violence	discussion group; focus on the nature, scope and prevention of various forms of violence	15	1	
University Reform	action-oriented; planning and testing of strategies for radicalizing and changing educational environments	10	2	
Radicalsim and Technology	discussion project; exploration of the role of radicals and radicalism in an industrialized and technological society	10	2	

Project	Description	Approx. No. of Participating Students	Supervisors Grad	Undergrad
Psychology of Non-Violent Action	discussion, reading, and action; analysis of the psychological implications and effectiveness of non-violence as a change strategy; participate in and analyze such non-violent protests such as the Washington Peace March and campus protests	15	1	
III. Understanding Self, Peers and Interpersonal Relationships.				
Male and Female Relationships In A Changing Society	unstructured group; balance of males and females using data generated by group to understand sex differences in personality, interpersonal styles, and culturally defined sex roles	20	4	
Non-verbal Interaction	semi-structured group; students and supervisors design and participate in non-verbal experiences and exercises in order to learn about non-verbal styles generally, and about self specifically	20	2	
The College Experience	unstructured group; focus is on experiences as freshmen, extent to which college environment meets students' needs, impact of college experience on juniors and seniors.	20	2	
Roles and Games Big People Play	semi-structured group; students analyze relationships in group and use techniques such as role playing to explore and concretize "games people play"	20	1	

Project	Description	Approx. No. of Participating Students	Supervisors Grad	Undergrad.
Sensitivity Training Groups and Human Relations Labs	unstructured groups; includes ongoing weekly groups as well as weekend marathon labs; experience varies with group and co-trainer styles; range covers group level analysis to mainly encounter; use of exercises, microlabs, non-verbals, vary with group; training and supervisory program for trainers and trainees; includes interracial T-groups	130 undergraduate participants 15 trainees; varying degrees of experience	35	5
Values, Value Conflicts, Stereotypes	unstructured discussion group; focus on conflicts between new learnings and established values and stereotypes as they emerge and are analyzed in the group	20	4	
Cross Cultural Project	unstructured group; students from different countries and cultures, attempt to understand each other and to learn about each others' countries and background	15	1	
Drugs and Social Behavior	semi-structured discussion group; students with varying degrees of drug experience (none to a lot) share experiences, explore relationship between drug-taking and behavior, as well as ethical and legal implications	15	1	
Toward Black Consciousness	semi-structured discussion group, predominantly Black students and supervisors deal with issues of identity as a Black student in a mainly white institution; how and around what should Black students be organized	50	4	

Project	Description	Approx. No. of Participating Students	Supervisors Grad	Undergrad
White Racism	unstructured group; focus is on the more subtle aspects of racism in interpersonal relationships as well as the use of oneself in developing theoretical propositions about racism	20	2	
Politics of Experience	unstructured group; use of self and others to test out and understand new ways of experiencing oneself and the world; explore the role of mystical and religious experiences	15	1	
Babes in Toyland	semi-structured group, observation, self analytic; students interact with different preverbal and verbal children; attempt to understand these children and the effect they have on students	15	2	
The Enormous Room	unstructured group; using E.E. Cummings, Enormous Room as a starting point, T-group-like exploration of relationships and group development	10	1	
IV. Disturbed Children, Adolescents and Adults				
York Woods Center (Ypsilanti, Mich.)	residential treatment for children and adolescents; students work directly with residents on a one-to-one basis or participate in groups; meet afterward with supervisors to discuss experience, raise questions, connect experience to readings and class	40	5	12 experienced students
Michigan Children's Institute (Ann Arbor, Mich.)	interim residence center for disturbed adolescents; students become involved in activities, tutoring and just socializing; meet with supervisor	9	1	

Project	Description	Approx. No. of Participating Students	Supervisors Grad	Supervisors Undergrad
Plymouth State Home (Plymouth, Mich.)	residential treatment and custodial hospital for retarded children; students work on the blind-retarded unit; relate to one-to-one basis and/or work on sensory-motor training language, reading, music; meet with supervisors	100	5	12 experienced students
Hawthorne Center (Northville, Mich)	inpatient and outpatient residential treatment center, children and adolescents; students work directly with patients and staff, meet with supervisors	8	2	
Northville State Hospital (Northville, Mich.)	state mental hospital; students placed in maximum security wards, in geriatrics as well as young adults; relate one-to-one, work with groups, take part in psychodrama, music, discussion groups; meet with supervisor	200	7	22 experienced students
Ypsilanti State Hospital (Ypsilanti, Mich.)	state mental hospital; students fit into various ongoing programs, groups or activities; meet with supervisors	15	1	2 experienced students
Maxey Boys' Training School (Whitmore Lake, Mich.)	training and custodial center for adolescents; students organize clubs, recreational activities and programs in the maximal security unit; meet with supervisors	60	4	6 experienced students
Community Mental Health, Halfway House (Ann Arbor, Michigan)	students planned, selected building, raised funds, arranged for legal, medical and social work staff, and are recruiting other students to live in a half-way house for ex-Northville and Ypsilanti State Hospital patients	15		1

Project	Description	Approx. No. of Participating Students	Supervisors Grad	Supervisors Undergrad
Walk-In Crisis Clinic (Ann Arbor, Mich.)	storefront walk-in clinic; students will be trained and supervised by permanent staff to make initial contact with client, refer serious cases to professional staff	8	2	
V. Education and Child Development Projects.				
South Lyon and Saline Classroom Participant Observation (South Lyon and Saline, Mich.)	elementary schools; students are placed directly in classrooms either observe, work with teacher as an aid or with individual or sub groups of students; meet with supervisors	100	8	9 experienced students
Sumpter Tutorial (Sumpter, Mich.)	tutorial program affiliated with now defunct school system; students involved in tutorial relationship or activity groups; meet with supervisor	30	3	1
OEO Tutorial (Ann Arbor and Vicinity)	tutorial program operated from the OEO office; students tutor, take children on trips or outings, or just build big brother relationships; meet with supervisors	80	5	9 experienced students
Sullivan Educational Center (Ann Arbor, Mich.)	Ann Arbor public school special education class for retarded children and young adults; students work with younsters on skills help with feeding and eating, aid special education teachers; meet with supervisor	12	2	
VI. The Arts and Mass Media				
Psychology of Art	discussion groups; focus on the artistic experience, creativity, the role of the artist	15	2	

Project	Description	Approx. No. of Participating Students	Supervisors Grad	Undergrad
Psychology and Modern Drama	discussion-role-playing group, focus on character analysis, interpersonal relationships in plays; use of audio and visual techniques for eliciting emotional and cognitive involvement	15	1	
The Garbage and the Flowers	semi-structured discussion groups; explores the ways of discriminating the garbage from the flowers, that which is ours and represents our life style and taste vs. that which is imposed by fashion and cultrual fads	18	1	
Television and the Mass Media	discussion-participation group; involves exploring the influence of advertisements and various programs by selective watching and discussion	15	2	
Values in American Cinema	discussion-participation; viewing and/or making films, analyzing their impact and messages	15	1	
Psychology and Literature	discussion group, focus on the analysis of persistent themes and selected characters in literature	18	2	

The current edition of Outreach is regarded by some with considerable ambivalence. On the one hand, the small group of teaching fellows who have been party to the growth and development of Outreach is proud of the fact that despite the size of the program, a tendency toward bureaucracy, and an increase in the number of content-oriented projects, (a somewhat disturbing development to those who primarily regard Outreach as a source of experiential and personal learning for their students) Outreach remains to a large extent, a fairly open and supportive system which attracts a large number of bright, creative graduate and experienced undergraduate students as supervisors and provides them with a protective umbrella under which they are free to experiment with unusual, real-life, experiential and even high risk projects with considerable autonomy and total responsibility. They are equally gratified by the continuing commitment on the part of many supervisors to meeting formally or informally in order to discuss their groups or projects, for mutual validation, support and growth.

This model of peer supervision has been developed most systematically in the T-group projects. Groups of co-trainers meet weekly to discuss their groups, to take part in theory or technique sessions; they can also participate in any of the different kinds of weekend labs and training sessions that are available. In addition, inexperienced supervisors, who eventually want to lead groups, can observe and participate in a variety of groups. The T-group supervisory and training program has developed to the point where a graduate course is being proposed in order to legitimize these experiences as part of the graduate student's professional training and development. For those not involved in the T-group projects, supervising within a project or participating in any of the formal or informal discussions of groups, students, teaching, or learning and innovation, affords graduate students a rich network of peer relationships and learning opportunities. This kind of a

learning climate seems to be more liberating (at least for a large number of graduate students) than the more usual graduate student-as-an-apprentice model.

One of the most surprising as well as reassuring observations about Outreach is that the initial fear of casualties expressed by some supervisors, faculty and others has never really materialized. In nearly four years of operation involving over seven thousand students, there has not been a single case where it could be determined a student had suffered serious or long term physical or emotional injury as a direct result of an Outreach experience. One should not exclude the possibility of unreported cases or ignore the fact that some students have reported that they have been temporarily shaken up by their Outreach experiences. This negligible casualty rate is quite striking since presumably naive freshmen are placed in close contact with seriously disturbed patients in maximum security units, since about half the students in Outreach (including one group which went to Washington for a non-violent peace protest) are transported by bus or car on a weekly basis to and from projects, occasionally under many poor weather conditions, and since many students have participated in intense and emotionally demanding T-group experiences. These risks, as well as the anxiety-arousing nature of the many projects have not discouraged students from continuing in Psychology. The contrary conclusion is suggested by the unusually large increase in the number of concentrates and majors. In fact, all of this suggests that many undergraduate students are much stronger, more independent, and more competent than they have been given credit for.

Paralleling the commitment on the part of a large number of students to continue in Psychology are some self-report data suggesting that those who participated in Outreach were more involved, modified their career plans more often, and became more concerned about life and social problems than students who were involved in alternative fourth hour activities. However, these Outreach students also reported that they had learned less psychology and new information than their non-Outreach

peers. (Jorgenson, 1966).[4] The increasing demand for supervisory positions on the part of graduate students (many of whom are not in the Psychology Department) and experienced Outreach alumni and the continuous and mutually satisfactory relationships between Outreach and about twenty hospitals, clinics, agencies, and schools should also be noted. It is appropriate at this point to expose the other side of the coin.

Outreach's size, complexity, step-child status, and structural unwieldness can become an administrator's nightmare, although the system does not as yet seem to be out of control. For example, about four weeks are required to type, mimeograph, and collate 1700 copies of the sixty page descriptive booklet for students each term. The University's transportation and room services staff who regard Outreach as an extracurricular activity have complained that Outreach is straining their resources, and funding from the University has been somewhat unreliable. In fact, for the past two years, Outreach has financed a good part of its own operating expenses though private donations, grants from the Wolverine Fund, the President of the University, and the State Department of Mental Health as well as from participating hospitals, agencies, and school systems. As a last resort this year , students have been charged a lab fee and contributions have been solicited from teaching fellows and supervisors. The mixture of pride and inconvenience experienced by some administrators and faculty affiliated with Outreach

---

4 Two additional large scale evaluative studies have been carried out more recently. The first, involved a pre-and post-administration to large groups of Outreach and Non-Outreach students of a battery of paper-and-pencil instruments measuring various personality dimensions, attitudes (e.g. toward mental illness and race), scientific thinking and amount of psychological information. A second study was carried out in which ten observers were each responsible for documenting eight students' experiences by observing them in their different projects all term and interviewing them on a regular basis. This data are still in the process of being coded, keypunched and analyzed.

is delightfully revealed in the following quotes taken with permission from a recent memorandum sent by the Acting Chairman of the Department of Psychology to the Office of the Assistant Dean of the College of L.S. & A.

> As I am sure both you and Dean Haber are aware, Project Outreach presents some of the same problems (and satisfactions!) as a highly precocious and physically robust progeny does to middle-aged parents. While the conception of this offspring was not wholly accidental, I believe that not even the most avid of its progenitors was quite prepared for the vigorous development that took place during the first two years of its existence. Clearly, the organism found an environment well suited to its genetic characteristics and it now begins to appear that just keeping it clothed and fed is starting to put some strain on the resources not only of its parents but of the more extended family as well.
>
> I recognize, of course, that no departmental program, much less any segment of any such program can be permitted to monopolize the available resources of the College. However important we or you feel that this particular educational experiment is, it cannot be allowed to infringe unduly upon the other aspects of the total instructional responsibilities that we have. Thus far, however, this program has operated on what can only be described as a "shoestring" basis. While there have undoubtedly been demands on classroom space and some limited cost to the University in connection with supervisory appointment, when viewed in the context of the number of students involved and the contributions this program is making toward the educational enrichment and the community relations aspects of the University's program, it is a source of some embarassment to me (and I think it should be to the College) how little support this program has actually received.
>
> We speak frequently of the need for educational innovation and the support of experimental programs beyond what is required for the routine operation of our standard curriculum, and with good justification in my view. To be blessed with such a highly adaptive approach to higher education as Project Outreach represents and to have it cost as little as this program has is truly, I think, a credit and an honor to those persons who have been responsible for its inception and administration during the past two years. Obviously I look on this program as a source of considerable pride from the Department's point of view and clearly I feel the College should view it likewise.
>
> If, as you seem to imply in your letter, this program has grown to such size and to such complexity as to provide serious administrative and fiscal problems for the College and University, then something will have to be done to curtail its growth and development in some manner.

> I do believe, however, that it would be a tragedy to either kill or severely starve so precocious, robust, and attractive an infant. If we must wean this brainchild at this point in order not to deprive its sibs, so be it. But I would hope that we would not lose sight of the rather exceptional characteristics and contributions which this program has already made to the undergraduate program and as a model for other potential programs of educational innovation and service.

The most challenging educational question raised by Outreach is that of how one goes about integrating the experiences of students with course content. A few examples will suffice to illustrate some of the dilemmas a teaching fellow may face when he makes a range of Outreach projects available to his students. If the teaching fellow is sincerely committed to helping his students integrate their Outreach experiences and the course content, when and how will this occur? If, for example, it is decided to devote half a class period a week to discussing Outreach or if students are encouraged to bring up relevant Outreach data at anytime, the teaching fellow must be prepared to accept the fact that the class will not have the necessary time to survey, in a prescribed sequence, the topics he had in mind. Even more perplexing for a teacher who hopes to prepare his students for advanced work is a student's preference to commit his time and energy in the course to a concentrated in-depth study of a particular problem area which he became interested in because of his Outreach experience. For example, how does a teaching fellow respond to a student in the Northville State Hospital project who expresses his desire to concentrate rather exclusively on psychotic processes, the impact of a mental hospital as an institution and therapy with psychotics? Or how does he deal with a Black student who prefers to read about the very personal and meaningful issues being raised for him in the Black Consciousness project, as opposed to studying a series of readings which seem irrelevant to him at that point. Also, consider the example of a bright, sensitive, but anti-intellectual student, who is convinced that the way he learns best is by means of his own direct and concrete experiencing rather than by means of abstract words and symbols. Thus, he proposes to spend his time participating in at

least three experiential projects. Or consider the case of the student who worked hard to understand why he was feeling so competitive toward his T-group trainer, who read up on authority relations in groups and who now expects to deal with these same issues in class.

Finally let us consider an inevitable and exceedingly difficult dilemma which strikes at the heart of the traditional view of higher education. Since Outreach represents a quarter of the student's committment in the course, it should theoretically count for at least 25% of the final grade. Therefore, how does a teaching fellow assess a student's performance on a hospital ward, in a T-group, or his participation in the Washington Peace March as a part of the Non-Violence Project? How much and what did he learn? Is requiring the student to list the symptoms of schizophrenia or the dimensions of the authority issue a fair sampling of what he has learned? If not, should he then be graded on his empathic skills, his openness to experience, or his tolerance for complexity and ambiguity or, on his ability to draw reasonable inferences from his observations? Or should satisfactory attendance be sufficient?

It is in this area that Outreach and the introductory course as a whole have generated ripples of concern throughout the College. It is reported that for Psychology 101 students as a whole the average grade is slightly closer to an A than to a B, and there seems to be little relationship between these grades and those in other courses. Thus, a student may have a D average in his other courses but an A in Psychology 101. (Milholland and Stock, 1968). Since an alternatiave evaluation process to the current grading system, such as pass-fail has not been available, over the past few years more and more teaching fellows have been opting for such solutions as self-grading or else they have given all the students in their classes A's or B's. The result is that administrators, deans, and counsellors no longer place any credibility in Psychology 101 grades. It is clear that Outreach is not solely responsible for this development, since a number of teaching fellows and faculty have been pressing

for something like a pass-fail option for some time and such a proposal has recently been submitted and approved. But this problem is certainly indicative of considerable disenchantment with grades and the related issues of evaluation, impersonality and power. Finally, it should be noted that efforts to innovate with respect to evaluation do not always involve an eager student pressing a conflicted teaching fellow. The pressure goes both ways and there are some students who for a variety of reasons have some investment in the current grading system and would resist faculty initiative in the direction of self-grading, pass-fail, or any other innovation.

As an educational innovation, Outreach derives a good deal of its vitality by offering learning opportunities that are socially and personally meaningful. It legitimizes feelings, intuition, affective and interpersonal learning and social action along with traditional cognitive content. In this sense, Outreach challenges a number of conceptions, practices and values as well as assumptions about students, teaching and learning that are sacred to the traditional university culture, especially those centering on notions of truth, quality control, and accredition.

However, the concerns facing supervisors and students involved in Outreach, extend beyond the classroom. A brief sampling of some persistently agonizing questions and moral dilemmas will suffice for now. A useful organizing theme is the nature of the contract between the students and the institutional and community populations.

This theme most frequently emerges as a student begins to ask whether his function is primarily to learn about groups such as mental patients, elementary school children, blind and/or retarded children, delinquents or others which are very different from himself, or whether he is "supposed to help them". For many students, functioning as a participant observer generates a considerable amount of descriptive affect. Some experience guilt about their intrusiveness, about their voyeurism, or

about taking something from the client population without giving something meaningful back in return. Others become angry and/or depressed as they begin to identify with the patients or children, as they experience the brutal reality of public institutional life, as their rescue fantasies are shattered and as they begin to feel impotent in the face of strong needs to do something about the conditions they observe in hospitals, treatment centers, school systems, or even in their peer relationships.

Those students who are able to commit themselves to some version of a helping relationship or to becoming an advocate for change at the institutional level often encounter different, but equally agonizing dilemmas. For example, many students spend a great deal of energy building a trusting "big brother" relationship with a tutee or a close relationship with an adult or adolescent patient. Often they are trapped by their own success. For many white tutors eventually must deal with the consequences of a close relationship with a young black tutee. Similarly a student who is a friend to a patient, or who has been successful in organizing a group of patients into a program or into a team for change must confront his fantasies of what is going to happen once the fifteen week program is over and he leaves. Many students are forced to question whether their committment is great enough to keep them coming back to the institution or to sustain the relationship after the course is over. A student must test the authenticity of his friendship as his patient-friend expresses his desire to meet on the outside, once he is released. These and other related issues are inevitably encountered by students, supervisors and teaching fellows both in and out of the classroom. Our experience has been that different resolutions are productive for different students and supervisors. In some instances it has even seemed appropriate to terminate the project. In closing then, it is reasonable to suggest that any concerted effort to build bridges between the classroom and the community has critical implications not only for the teacher-student relationship but also for the joint education-community institutional partnership.

Note: This presentation is an extensively modified version of a paper by S. Cytrynbaum and R.D. Mann entitled The Community As Campus: Project Outreach, to be published in Runkel, Harrison and Runkel, (eds.), The Changing College Classroom.